

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the performance of a thorough search.

Claims 1-5, 7-8, and 18-19 have been amended. Claims 24-46 and 48 have been canceled. Claims 49-72 have been newly added. Hence, Claims 1-23, 47, and 49-72 are pending in the present application.

The issues raised in the final Office Action mailed March 17, 2009 and the Advisory Action mailed June 16, 2009 are addressed hereinafter.

I. ISSUES RELATED TO THE CITED ART

A. INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1

Claim 1 was rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Abrams et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,675,350 (“ABRAMS”) in view of Polizzi et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0052954 (“POLIZZI”). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

1. ABRAMS and POLIZZI do not describe the feature of Claim 1 of inserting the component that was generated by the portlet into the web page, where inserting the component includes inserting the component at the location, in the structure of the web page, of the reference to the portlet.

Among other features, Claim 1 comprises the features of:

wherein the **web page** has a designed hard-coded structure that includes **a reference to a portlet** that generates a component of the web page;
after the web page has been designed and stored, receiving a request to display the web page;
in response to receiving a request to display the web page, performing the steps of:
determining that the web page is associated with a page parameter from the one or more page parameters;
...;
inserting the component that was generated by the portlet **into the web page**;
wherein the step of inserting the component includes **inserting the component at the location, in the structure of the web page, of the reference to the portlet**;
... .

It is respectfully submitted that ABRAMS and POLIZZI do not describe these features of Claim 1.

Nothing in ABRAMS describes that, in response to a request to display a web page that has a page parameter, a component is inserted into that same page, where the content of the component is based on the value of the page parameter. For example, what is illustrated in Figs. 2A and 2B of ABRAMS cannot correspond to the page of Claim 1 because Figs. 2A-2B show pages from which information is extracted but is never inserted into (i.e., the ABRAMS' HTML parser tool cannot insert anything in a page, such as CNN News, from which the tool extracts summary information/headlines). Further, in col. 5, line 45 to col. 6, line 32 ABRAMS describes several independent and different mechanisms in which already-extracted summary information/headlines may be displayed to the user. For example, the summary information/headlines may be displayed as a ticker (see ABRAMS, col. 5, lines 45-54), as a tabbed display (see Fig. 6, and col. 5, line 55 to col. 6, line 5), as a portal view (col. 6, lines 6-11), and as a user-customized portal view (col. 6, lines 12-32.) Significantly, however, none of these mechanisms describes that a component is inserted into the same page that has a page parameter, where the component is generated by a portlet based on a value of the page parameter. For example, in col. 6, lines 12-25 ABRAMS describes that HTML code may be generated as a user-customized portal view in order to display summary information/headlines which have already been extracted by using ABRAMS' HTML parser tool. However, a dynamically generated portal view (such as the user-customized portal view in ABRAMS) is not a pre-designed and stored page into which a component is inserted, where the component is generated by a portlet based on a value of a page parameter of the page (such as the web page featured in Claim 1).

In contrast, the above features of Claim 1 indicate that a web page requested for display is: (1) designed and stored prior to receiving the request to display the page; (2) the same page that is associated with a page parameter (from page parameters that are mapped to portlet parameters in a mapping); and (3) the same page into which a component (that is generated by a portlet based on a value of the page parameter) is inserted at a location, in the structure of the page, of a reference to the portlet . Since none of the ABRAMS' mechanisms for displaying already-extracted summary information/headlines involves inserting anything in the page from which the summary information/headlines is extracted based on user-specified parser constraints, ABRAMS does not describe the above features of Claim 1.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that POLIZZI does not cure these deficiencies of ABRAMS with respect to the above features of Claim 1. For example, POLIZZI describes a portal system that presents data to users in portal pages, where each user's portal page may be customized to suit that user's specific needs. (See POLIZZI, paragraphs [0006]-[0007].) In POLIZZI's portal system, a portal page presents data to a user in the form of portal objects (see paragraph [0030]), where the portal objects are essentially files that may have various MIME types (see paragraphs [0038]-[0039]). POLIZZI also describes that a user may customize what is displayed in her portal page (see paragraph [0032]), and that the portal system may present to the user HTML forms through which the user may submit input data for jobs that the user can execute on a job server (see paragraph [0033]). Significantly, however, POLIZZI expressly describes that the content displayed in the portal page is manually selected by the user (e.g., see paragraphs [0030], [0081]) and that a user-personalized portal page is assembled on an ad-hoc basis when the user logs into the system (e.g., see paragraph [0092]). Thus, the portal page of POLIZZI is not a pre-existing designed and stored page into which a component is inserted, where the component is generated by a

portlet based on a value of a page parameter of the page, such as the page featured in Claim 1. To put it differently, the content to be displayed in a particular portal page of POLIZZI is selected by a particular user and is not generated by portlets based on the values of page parameters in the portal page.

For the foregoing reasons, ABRAMS and POLLIZI do not describe or suggest the features of Claim 1 of: in response to receiving a request to display the web page, performing the steps of: determining that the web page is associated with a page parameter from the one or more page parameters; ... and inserting the component that was generated by the portlet into the web page, where inserting the component includes inserting the component at the location, in the structure of the web page, of the reference to the portlet.

2. ABRAMS and POLIZZI do not describe at least several other features of Claim 1.

Claim 1 comprises at least several other features that are not described or suggested by ABRAMS and POLIZZI. For example, it is respectfully submitted that ABRAMS and POLIZZI do not describe at least the following features of Claim 1:

generating and storing a mapping that maps one or more page parameters to one or more portlet parameters, wherein the mapping is stored separate from web pages associated with the one or more page parameters;
...;
retrieving and inspecting the mapping to determine that the page parameter is mapped to a portlet parameter of the portlet that generates the component based, at least in part, on the portlet parameter;
... .

Detailed arguments regarding these features of Claim 1 have been provided in the reply to the final Office Action. However, due to the already identified differences between Claim 1 and ABRAMS in view of POLIZZI, to expedite the positive resolution of this case a separate discussion of those features is not included at this time.

It is noted that the Advisory Action provides several reasons of why the Applicants arguments in the reply to the final Office Action are not persuasive. The Applicants disagree with these Advisory Action reasons because these reasons rest on incorrect understanding of the disclosures of ABRAMS and POLIZZI. For example, the Advisory Action asserts that the tabbed display 630 in Fig. 6 of ABRAMS is based on user preference data that is provided for generating a user-customized portal view. This assertion is clearly incorrect because in col. 5, lines 45-47, in col. 5, line 55 to col. 6, line 5, and in col. 6, lines 6-25 ABRAMS makes it very clear that the user-customized portal view is a mechanism for displaying summary information/headlines that is different and independent from the tabbed display 630 in ABRAMS' Fig. 6. In another example, the Advisory Action asserts that in paragraph [0092] POLIZZI describes a mapping such as the mapping featured in Claim 1. This assertion is clearly incorrect because in paragraph [0092] POLIZZI does not describe anything that corresponds to page parameters of designed and stored web pages that are mapped to portlet parameters of portlets that are operable to generate components for insertion in the web pages; rather, as discussed above, in paragraph [0092] POLIZZI describes that a user-personalized portal page is assembled on an ad-hoc basis when the user logs into the system. The Advisory Action also asserts that it considers the subsets of data provided in POLIZZI's portal page as corresponding to the portlets of Claim 1. This assertion is also incorrect because the subsets of data displayed in POLIZZI's portal page are not executable code that is operable to generate page components, as expressly featured in Claim 1.

For the foregoing reasons, ABRAMS and POLIZZI do not describe or suggest all features of Claim 1. Thus, Claim 1 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in

view of POLIZZI. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

B. INDEPENDENT CLAIM 18

Claim 18 was rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of POLIZZI. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 18 includes features similar to the features of Claim 1 discussed above. Specifically, Claim 18 includes the features of: wherein the web page has a designed hard-coded structure that includes a reference to a portlet that generates a component of the web page; and wherein, when the web page is rendered, the component generated by the portlet is inserted in the web page at the location, in the structure of the web page, of the reference to the portlet. Since, as discussed above with respect to Claim 1, ABRAMS and POLIZZI do not describe or suggest these features, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 18 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS and POLIZZI for at least the reasons given above with respect to Claim 1.

Further, Claim 18 comprises at least several other features that are not described or suggested by ABRAMS and POLIZZI. For example, it is respectfully submitted that ABRAMS and POLIZZI do not describe at least the following features of Claim 18:

- generating and storing a first mapping that maps one or more events to one or more actions and one or more event output parameters to one or more page parameters, wherein the first mapping is stored separate from web pages associated with the one or more page parameters;
- ...;
- determining, based on the first mapping and the passed data, an action to perform in response to the particular event;
- inspecting the first mapping to determine that an event output parameter associated with the particular event is mapped to a page parameter;
- ...

Detailed arguments regarding these features of Claim 18 have been provided in the reply to the final Office Action. However, due to the already identified differences between Claim 18 and ABRAMS in view of POLIZZI, to expedite the positive resolution of this case a separate discussion of those features is not included at this time.

It is noted that the Advisory Action provides several reasons of why the Applicants arguments for Claim 18 in the reply to the final Office Action are not persuasive. The Applicants disagree with these Advisory Action reasons because these reasons rest on incorrect understanding of the disclosures of ABRAMS and POLIZZI. For example, the Advisory Action asserts that in Fig. 10, reference 1046 and in paragraph [0089] POLIZZI describes time events for a particular page that have event output parameters. This assertion is clearly incorrect not the least because Fig. 10 of ABRAMS does not include a reference number “1046”. Further, POLIZZI clearly describes that a time event is associated with a schedule that defines the timetable for executing a particular job (see paragraph [0060]). Thus, while a time event in POLIZZI may directly cause the execution of a corresponding job, the time event itself does not have any event output parameter that can be mapped to a page parameter. Therefore, the time event of POLIZZI does not correspond to the events featured in Claim 18, and for at least this reason POLIZZI does not describe the first mapping featured in Claim 18. In another example, the Advisory Action asserts that the hyperlinks and text shown in pane 260 of Fig. 2A in ABRAMS somehow correspond to the feature of Claim 18 of determining, based on the first mapping and the passed data, an action to perform in response to the particular event. This assertion is incorrect because absolutely nothing in ABRAMS describes or suggests a mapping that is stored separately from web pages and that maps one or more events to one or more actions and one or more event output parameters to one or more page parameters (such as the mapping featured in Claim 18).

Thus, for at least this reason ABRAMS does not describe or suggest the feature of Claim 18 of determining, based on the first mapping and the passed data, an action to perform in response to the particular event.

For the foregoing reasons, ABRAMS and POLIZZI do not describe or suggest all features of Claim 18. Thus, Claim 18 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of POLIZZI. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 18 is respectfully requested.

C. DEPENDENT CLAIMS 2-17, 19-23, AND 47

Claims 2-3, 5-14, 16-17, 19-23, and 47 were rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of POLIZZI. Claim 4 was rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of POLIZZI and further in view of Hind et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2004/0205555 (“HIND”). Claim 15 was rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of POLIZZI and further in view of Katariya et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,564,251 (“KATARIYA”).

Each of Claims 2-17, 19-23, and 47 depends directly or indirectly from one of independent Claims 1 and 18, and thus includes each and every feature of the independent base claim. Furthermore, in rejecting Claims 4 and 15 the Office Action relies explicitly on ABRAMS and POLIZZI, and not on HIND or KATARIYA, to show the features discussed above with respect to Claims 1 and 18. Because ABRAMS and POLIZZI do not teach the subject matter of Claims 1 and 18, any combination of ABRAMS and POLIZZI with the other two references necessarily fails to teach the complete combination recited in any dependent claim of Claims 1 or 18. Thus, each of Claims 2-17, 19-23, and 47 is allowable for the reasons given above for Claims 1 and 18.

In addition, each of Claims 2-17, 19-23, and 47 introduces one or more additional features that independently render it patentable. However, due to the fundamental differences already identified, to expedite the positive resolution of this case a separate discussion of those features is not included at this time. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 2-17, 19-23, and 47 are allowable for the reasons given above with respect to Claims 1 and 18. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 2-17, 19-23, and 47 is respectfully requested.

D. NEW CLAIMS 49-72

New independent Claims 49 and 66 include features similar to the above-discussed features of Claims 1 and 18, respectively, except in the context of a computer-readable medium. Specifically, Claims 49 and 66 feature a “computer-readable volatile or non-volatile medium storing one or more sequences of instructions...”. As described in paragraph [0065] of the present specification, non-volatile media includes, for example, optical or magnetic disks, and volatile media includes dynamic memory. Thus, the volatile and non-volatile media featured in Claims 49 and 66 are clearly directed to articles of manufacture and, therefore, to statutory subject matter.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 49 and 66 are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons given above with respect to Claims 1 and 18. Further, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 49 and 66 are directed to patentable subject matter as required by 35 U.S.C. § 101. Consideration and allowance of Claims 49 and 66 is therefore respectfully requested.

Each of new Claims 50-65 and 67-72 depends directly or indirectly from one of new independent Claims 49 and 66, and thus includes each and every feature of the independent base claim. Thus, each of Claims 50-65 and 67-72 is allowable for at least the reasons given

above for Claims 49 and 66. Consideration and allowance of Claims 50-65 and 67-72 is therefore respectfully requested.

II. CONCLUSION

The Applicants believe that all issues raised in the final Office Action and in the Advisory Action have been addressed. Further, for the reasons set forth above, the Applicants respectfully submit that allowance of the pending claims is appropriate. Entry of the RCE filed concurrently herewith and reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks herein.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

A petition for extension of time, to the extent necessary to make this reply timely filed, is hereby made. If applicable, a law firm's check for the petition for extension of time fee is enclosed herewith. If any applicable fee is missing or insufficient, throughout the pendency of this application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any applicable fees and to credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 2-1302.

Respectfully submitted,
HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: July 17, 2009

/StoychoDDraganoff#56181/
Stoycho D. Draganoff
Reg. No. 56,181

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, California 95110-1089
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1080 ext. 208
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076